arXiv:1403.3773v3 [math-ph] 27 Oct 2014

Quantum models with spectrum generated by the flows of polynomial zeros

Alexander Moroz
Wave-scattering.com

A class $\mathcal{R}$ of purely bosonic models is characterized having the following properties in a Hilbert space of analytic functions: (i) wave function $\psi(\epsilon,z)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\phi_n(\epsilon)z^n$ is the *generating function* for orthogonal polynomials $\phi_n(\epsilon)$ of a *discrete* energy variable ϵ, (ii) any Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_b\in\mathcal{R}$ has nondegenerate purely point spectrum that corresponds to infinite discrete support of measure $d\nu(x)$ in the orthogonality relation of the polynomials ϕ_n, (iii) the support is determined exclusively by the points of discontinuity of $\nu(x)$, (iv) the spectrum of $\hat{H}_b\in\mathcal{R}$ can be numerically determined as fixed points of monotonic flows of the zeros of orthogonal polynomials $\phi_n(\epsilon)$, (v) one can compute practically an unlimited number of energy levels (e.g. 2^{53} in double precision). If a model of $\mathcal{R}$ is exactly solvable, its spectrum can only assume one of four qualitatively different types. The results are applied to spin-boson quantum models that are, at least partially, diagonalizable and have at least single one-dimensional irreducible component in the spin subspace. Examples include the Rabi model and its various generalizations.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ge, 02.30.Ik, 42.50.Pq

I. INTRODUCTION

Our work concerns models for which one can formulate a formal quantization criterion in terms of infinite continued fraction

$$\mathbb{F}(x)\equiv a_0+\frac{-b_1}{a_1-}\frac{b_2}{a_2-}\frac{b_3}{a_3-}\cdots=0, \tag{1}$$

where the coefficients a_n and $b_n\neq 0$ are functions of an energy variable x. A prototype of the criterion (1) is the *Schweber quantization condition* (cf. Eq. (A.16) of Ref. [1]) initially formulated for a displaced harmonic oscillator and the Rabi, or single boson, model [2]. The gist of the present work is to explore consequences of that the *zeros* of the function $\mathbb{F}(x)$ are equivalent to the *poles* of infinite continued fraction

$$\mathbb{E}(x)\equiv\frac{-b_0}{a_0-}\frac{b_1}{a_1-}\frac{b_2}{a_2-}\cdots=-\frac{b_0}{\mathbb{F}(x)}. \tag{2}$$

In particular, let us consider the Schrödinger equation

$$\hat{H}\Psi(z)=E\Psi(z) \tag{3}$$

induced by a model Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ in the product Hilbert space $\mathcal{B}=\mathfrak{b}\otimes\mathbb{C}^N$, where $\mathfrak{b}$ is the Bargmann space of analytic functions [1, 3] and $\mathbb{C}^N$ is N-dimensional spin subspace [4–9]. We assume that $\hat{H}$ possesses a symmetry group G that has at least single *one-dimensional irreducible representation* in the spin subspace [4–11]. On many occasions (e.g. if $\hat{H}$ is a linear combination of the bosonic operators a^+a, a and a^+) the purely bosonic Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_b$ describing the irreducible component is intrinsically *tridiagonal*. Then the eigenvalue equation reduces to a *three-term recurrence relation* (TTRR) [1, 6–9]

$$\phi_{n+1}+a_n\phi_n+b_n\phi_{n-1}=0 \qquad (n\geq 1), \tag{4}$$

and a *two-term* condition on ϕ_0 and ϕ_1 [6],

$$\phi_1+a_0\phi_0=0. \tag{5}$$

Here $\{\phi_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ are the sought expansion coefficients of an entire function in $\mathfrak{b}$,

$$\psi(z)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\phi_n z^n, \tag{6}$$

corresponding to the one-dimensional irreducible component of Ψ described by $\hat{H}_b$ (see Sec. V B below). In fact, there always exists an orthonormal basis $\{\mathbf{e}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ such that a given self-adjoint operator $\hat{H}$ takes on a *tridiagonal* form,

$$\hat{H}\mathbf{e}_n=\tilde{a}_n\mathbf{e}_n+\tilde{b}_{n+1}\mathbf{e}_{n+1}+\tilde{b}_n\mathbf{e}_{n-1}, \tag{7}$$

with *real* recurrence coefficients and with $\tilde{b}_n\geq 0$, $n\geq 0$ [12, 13]. In such a basis, (i) the expansion coefficients ϕ_n are polynomials of the n-th order of an *orthogonal polynomial sequence* (OPS) of a *discrete* variable [7, 8, 12–15] and hence (ii) the wave function $\psi(z)$ is the *generating function* for the polynomials [7, 8, 12, 13]. Here the discrete variable means that the *distribution* function $\nu(x)$ in the orthogonality relations of the polynomials (see appendix) is an increasing *step* function.

The outline of the present work is as follows. In Sec. II we define a *recurrence class of purely bosonic models*, $\mathcal{R}$, for which the quantization criterion (1) can be shown to follow from (4) [1, 6–9]. The class $\mathcal{R}$ is broad enough to encompass the Rabi model [7, 8] and its various generalizations. The Rabi model, which describes the simplest fully quantized interaction between light and matter [cf. Eq. (11) below], can be realized in a rich variety of different setups such as Josephson junctions, circuit quantum electrodynamics, trapped ions, superconductors, and semiconductors [16–19]. The model plays a fundamental role in various applications of quantum

optics, in implementation of diverse protocols in contemporary quantum information, with potential applications to future quantum technologies [16–19]. In its semiclassical form, the model is the basis for understanding nuclear magnetic resonance.

In Sec. III it is proven that $\mathbb{E}(x)$ is related to the measure $d\nu(x)$ by the *Stieltjes transform* [Eq. (18) below]. $\mathbb{E}(x)$ has only simple poles for $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$, which coincide with the points of discontinuity of $\nu(x)$. On labeling the poles of $\mathbb{E}(x)$ in increasing order, the nth pole can be alternatively recovered as a fixed point of the flow of the nth zeros of polynomials of the OPS. The transformation (2) from $\mathbb{F}(x)$ to $\mathbb{E}(x)$ enables one to translate the above results for the *poles* of $\mathbb{E}(x)$ to those for the *zeros* of $\mathbb{F}(x)$. In particular, $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$ has nondegenerate purely point spectrum [20] that corresponds to the points of discontinuity of $\nu(x)$. As elaborated in Sec. IV, a direct practical consequence of the result is an entirely new, efficient, and relatively general method in determining the spectrum. Contrary to searching for zeros of $\mathbb{F}(x)$, the spectrum coincides with the limit points of the flows of zeros of appropriate orthogonal polynomials of a discrete variable, which can be determined much more efficiently. For example, on using a very simple stepping algorithm, we were able to determine up to ca *1350* energy levels per parity subspace for the Rabi model [i.e. almost two orders of magnitude more than is possible to obtain from the Schweber quantization condition (1)] [8]. We sketch the basic features of an improved algorithm that allows to determine practically an *unlimited* number of energy levels within corresponding machine precision.

Sec. V is divided into a number of subsections where our results are extensively discussed from various angles: comparison of $\mathcal{R}$ and quasi-exactly-solvable models (sec. V A), the concept of *almost exactly solvable models* (sec. V B), numerical issues (sec. V D), and relation with earlier work (sec. V E). We then conclude with Sec. VI. Some additional technical remarks are relegated to appendices.

II. RECURRENCE CLASS $\mathcal{R}$ OF PURELY BOSONIC MODELS

The coefficients $\{\phi_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ define an entire function in $\mathfrak{b}$ whenever the sum $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\phi_n|^2 n!$ converges (cf. Eq. (1.4) of Ref. [3]). (Note in passing that the Bargmann condition, which corresponds to the Hilbert space of entire functions of growth $(\frac{1}{2}, 2)$, presumes the standard measure $(1/\pi)e^{-|z|^2}\, dzd\bar{z}$ in $\mathbb{C}$. In the Hilbert spaces of entire functions of different growth another measure and convergence criterion apply [21].) The quantization criterion (1) is rigorous consequence of the eigenvalue equation (3) provided that the TTRR (4) [unless otherwise stated, considered in the absence of the two-term condition (5)] has a *minimal* solution $\{m_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ with $m_0 \neq 0$ (cf. Theorem 1.1 due to Pincherle in Ref. [22]). The minimal solution exists if for any other linearly independent solution $\{d_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ of the TTRR (4) one has $\lim_{n\to\infty} m_n/d_n = 0$ [22]. In the latter case all other linearly independent solutions are called *dominant* [22]. The latter are not unique as any linear combination of m_n and d_n yields another dominant solution. (Note that there might be TTRR which do not have any minimal solution [23].)

In what follows, we limit ourselves further to the case when:

(**A**) the coefficients a_n's are *linear* functions of an energy variable x, i.e., $a_n = -(\alpha_n x - c_n)$, where the coefficients α_n and c_n are *real* and independent of x, and $\alpha_n \neq 0$ for $n \geq 1$.

The condition (**A**) is not a serious constraint, because it is always met in Haydock's basis [12]. The TTRR (4) then becomes a defining equation for *orthogonal polynomials*. Indeed, according to the *Favard-Shohat-Natanson* theorems (given as Theorems I-4.1 and I-4.4 of Ref. [24]), the necessary and sufficient condition for a family of polynomials $\{p_n\}$ (with degree $p_n = n$) to form a positive definite OPS is that p_n's satisfy a TTRR (4) and (5) with the coefficients as specified above, together with the initial condition $p_{-1} = 0$ and $p_0 = \text{const}$. Without any loss of generality, a suitable rescaling of ϕ_n [7, 8] enables one to recast (4) as the TTRR of a *monic* OPS [25]

$$p_n(x) = (x - c_{n-1})p_{n-1}(x) - \lambda_{n-1}p_{n-2}(x), \qquad (8)$$

$$p_{-1}(x) = 0, \qquad p_0(x) = 1, \qquad (9)$$

where $\lambda_n \neq 0$, $n \geq 1$ and we keep the notation c_n also for the rescaled coefficients. Because neither the TTRR (4) nor the two-term condition (5) contains b_0, one can in virtue of $p_{-1} \equiv 0$ always set the rescaled b_0 as $\lambda_0 = 1$ [7, 8].

Because the present work is concerned with the part of spectrum corresponding to a *one-dimensional irreducible component* of Ψ described by purely bosonic $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$, it is obvious to focus on the *discrete* spectrum. The spectrum can be discrete only if (i) dominant solutions of the TTRR (4) do not generate an element of $\mathfrak{b}$ and, simultaneously, (ii) the minimal solution of the TTRR (4) does so. Indeed, the system of the TTRR (4) with (5) as an initial condition has always a *unique* solution [22]. The unique solution is in general a linear combination of the minimal and dominant solutions. However, the unique solution is in $\mathfrak{b}$ only in the special case if it reduces to the minimal solution [6]. Under all other circumstances either both minimal and dominant solutions generate functions from $\mathfrak{b}$, or none does so. In the latter case the spectrum is obviously *empty*, whereas in the former case the spectrum is necessarily *continuous*. Indeed, for any energy there would exist a unique solution of the TTRR (4) with (5) [22]. Irrespective if the solution is a dominant or minimal one, it would be in $\mathfrak{b}$, and hence in the spectrum.

Let the recurrence coefficients assume an asymptotic

powerlike dependence as a function of n [6]

$$a_n \sim an^{\alpha}, \qquad b_n \sim bn^{\beta} \qquad (n \to \infty), \tag{10}$$

where a and b are proportionality constants. The *Perron-Kreuser* theorem (Theorem 2.3 in Ref. [22]) implies that (i) a *minimal* solution exists and (ii) *discrete* spectrum is possible provided that any of the following alternatives is satisfied:

- **(a)** $\alpha > -1/2$, $\beta < \alpha - (1/2)$,
- **(b)** $\alpha > -1/2$, $\beta = \alpha - (1/2)$, $|b| < |a|$,
- **(c)** $\alpha = -1/2$, $|a| \geq 1$, $\beta < -1$,
- **(d)** $\alpha = -1/2$, $\beta = -1$, $|t_1| \geq 1$, $|t_2| < 1$.

Here the first three alternatives follow from case (a) of the Perron-Kreuser theorem, whereas the last one is a consequence of the theorem case (b). The conditions **(a)**-**(d)** define a "*recurrence*" class $\mathcal{R}$ of quantum models. The class is here defined broader than in our earlier work [6] by including also cases **(c)** and **(d)**, in order to accommodate more general Hilbert spaces of entire functions [21].

A. Examples

After a rather formal and abstract introduction of $\mathcal{R}$, we argue that the conditions for $\mathcal{R}$ are, in broad sense, natural. For example, the condition (**A**) is automatically satisfied if $\hat{H}$ is a *linear* combination of a^+a, a and a^+. Indeed, upon the action of a^+a, $a = (d/dz)$ and $a^+ = z$ on $\psi(z)$ in Eq. (6), the coefficient of the resulting z^n monomial will become $n\phi_n$, $(n+1)\phi_{n+1}$, and ϕ_{n-1}, respectively. Therefore, if $\hat{H}$ is a linear combination of a^+a, a and a^+, the eigenvalue equation for any $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$ describing the one-dimensional irreducible component of Ψ inevitably reduces to a *three-term recurrence relation* (TTRR) of the type (**A**) with $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta = -1$, i.e. corresponding to case **(a)**. Even if the condition (**A**) is not automatically satisfied, it is only a question of finding an appropriate orthonormal basis $\{\mathbf{e}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ to bring a given Hamiltonian to a tridiagonal form (7) [12, 13].

Not surprisingly, the class $\mathcal{R}$ is broad enough to encompass the Rabi model [7, 8] and its various generalizations. The Rabi model [2] describes the simplest interaction between a cavity mode with a frequency ω and a two-level system with a resonance frequency ω_0. The model is characterized by the Hamiltonian [1, 2]

$$\hat{H}_R = \hbar\omega \mathbb{1}\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a} + \hbar g\sigma_1(\hat{a}^\dagger + \hat{a}) + \mu\sigma_3 \tag{11}$$

acting in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{B} = \mathfrak{b} \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$, where $\mu = \hbar\omega_0/2$, $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{a}^\dagger$ are the conventional boson annihilation and creation operators satisfying commutation relation $[\hat{a}, \hat{a}^\dagger] = 1$, and g is a coupling constant [1, 3]. In what follows, $\mathbb{1}$ is the unit matrix, σ_j are the Pauli matrices in their standard representation, and we set the reduced Planck constant $\hbar = 1$. $\hat{H}_R$ is invariant under the parity $\hat{\Pi} = \sigma_3\hat{\pi}$, where $\hat{\pi}a\hat{\pi}^{-1} = -a$ and $\hat{\pi}a^+\hat{\pi}^{-1} = -a^+$. $\mathcal{B}$ can be thus written as a direct sum $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_+ \oplus \mathcal{B}_-$ of the parity eigenspaces, or of invariant subspaces $\mathcal{B}_\pm$. In each of them the Rabi model is characterized by a corresponding three-term recurrence (cf. Eq. (37) of Ref. [6])

$$\phi^{\pm}_{n+1} + \frac{1}{\kappa(n+1)}\left[n - \epsilon \pm (-1)^n\Delta\right]\phi^{\pm}_n + \frac{1}{n+1}\,\phi^{\pm}_{n-1} = 0, \tag{12}$$

where energy variable $x = \epsilon \equiv E^{\pm}/\omega$, $\kappa = g/\omega$ reflects the coupling strength, and $\Delta = \mu/\omega$ [6]. Upon comparing with (10), one has $\alpha = 0$, $\beta = -1 < \alpha - (1/2)$, which corresponds to case **(a)** [6–8]. The substitution $\phi_n \to P_n/n!$ transforms the initial recurrence (12) into TTRR (8) of a positive definite monic OPS [7]. The case of a displaced harmonic oscillator is the exactly solvable limit of $\hat{H}_R$ for $\mu = 0$ that corresponds to $\Delta = 0$, whereby the recurrences (12) reduce to Eq. (A.17) of Ref. [1].

It is useful to remind here that the Rabi model with a "wrong" negative sign of its parameters g and μ (cf. Eq. 12 of Ref. [11]) was used to describe an excitation hopping between two sites and the interaction of a dipolar impurity (paraelectric or paraelastic) with a crystal lattice [11]. The sign change induces sign reversal of κ and Δ in the TTRR (12), but otherwise does not change any its essential features.

Further models can be obtained by changing or introducing different interaction terms to the Rabi model. Following Appendix of Ref. [26], the Rabi Hamiltonian (11) supplemented with a *momentum* dependent interaction term

$$V = i\sigma_2 g_b(a - a^+)$$

remains invariant with regard to the parity operator $\hat{\Pi}$, and thus amenable to the Fulton-Gouterman transformation (FGT) [4, 27], resulting in a pair of TTRR.

Several groups [28, 29] studied the generalized Rabi model

$$\hat{H}_{\rm gR} = \omega\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a} + \mu\sigma_3 + g_1(\hat{a}^\dagger\sigma_- + a\sigma_+) + g_2(\hat{a}^\dagger\sigma_+ + a\sigma_-),$$

which interpolates between the Jaynes and Cummings model (for $g_2 = 0$) and the original Rabi model $g_1 = g_2$. The model, which is again invariant with regard to the parity operator $\hat{\Pi}$, and thus amenable to the FGT [27], can be mapped onto the model describing a two-dimensional electron gas with *Rashba* ($g_R \sim g_1$) and *Dresselhaus* ($g_D \sim g_2$) spin-orbit couplings subject to a perpendicular magnetic field.

There is an outside chance that a *driven Rabi model* having an extra driving term $\lambda\sigma_1$ [9, 30, 31] could also be treated within our framework. Although the driven Rabi model is not invariant with regard to $\hat{\Pi}$, Gardas and Dajka [30] argued that it possesses a *nonlocal* parity.

However explicit form of the *nonlocal* parity operator has not been provided and it is unclear if it could be useful for a FGT.

Another option is to consider models in the spin space $\mathbb{C}^N$ with $N > 2$. The so-called Rabi model for N-state atoms which can be diagonalized in the spin subspace has been recently studied by Albert [5]. A $\mathbb{Z}_N$ symmetric chiral Rabi model has been recently introduced by Zhang [10].

Nonlinear single-mode terms (such as a^k and $(a^+)^k$ with $k \geq 2$) and multi-mode terms (e.g. $a_1 a_2$ and $a_1^+ a_2^+$) would naively lead to higher-order recurrences than the fundamental TTRR (4). Nonetheless, through judicious application of the representation theory for higher order polynomial deformations of the $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra via a Jordan-Schwinger like construction method [9, 32, 33], and ensuing algebraization of the spin-boson systems, such *nonlinear* models are not excluded from the scope of the present work. Indeed, as shown by Zhang [9], a TTRR also arises in the case of the *two-photon* and *two-mode Rabi models*, which both enjoy a parity symmetry and which can be described by $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$ [34].

III. SPECTRUM GENERATED BY THE FLOWS OF POLYNOMIAL ZEROS

For $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$, the infinite continued fraction in Eq. (1) can be expressed as the limit [7]

$$r_0 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{P_{n-1}^{(2)}(x)}{P_n^{(1)}(x)}, \tag{13}$$

where, given TTRR (8), the polynomials $P_n^{(\upsilon)}$, $\upsilon = 0, 1, 2$ are defined by [35]

$$P_n^{(\upsilon)}(x) = (x - c_{n-1+\upsilon}) P_{n-1}^{(\upsilon)}(x) - \lambda_{n-1+\upsilon} P_{n-2}^{(\upsilon)}(x), \quad (n \geq 1). \tag{14}$$

The initial condition is the same as in Eq. (9). For the sake of notation, the polynomials of the OPS for $\upsilon = 0$ will be denoted simply as P_n. Thus the p_n's, defined earlier by the TTRR (8) that follows directly from the initial TTRR (4), has become P_n. The respective monic OPS with $\upsilon = 1, 2$ are called *associated* to $\{P_n\}$ (see Sec. III-4 of Ref. [24]) [35]. The need of three different OPS is obvious: whereas $\{P_n\}$ determines the expansion coefficients of the physical state, the pair $\{P_n^{(1)}\}$ and $\{P_n^{(2)}\}$ defines the infinite continued fraction in Eq. (1).

Analogously to the infinite continued fraction in Eq. (1),

$$\mathbb{E}(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{P_{n-1}^{(1)}(x)}{P_n(x)} \tag{15}$$

[cf. Eq. (13)]. Indeed, the infinite continued fraction (2) is obtained from that in Eq. (1) by a substitution $(a_n, b_n) \to (a_{n-1}, b_{n-1})$. The latter corresponds to the substitution $\upsilon \to \upsilon - 1$ in Eq. (14).

Let x_{nl}, $l = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, denote the zeros of $P_n(x)$ arranged in increasing order [36]. For any n and $l = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$ one has

$$x_{nl} < x_{n-1,l} < x_{n,l+1} \tag{16}$$

(cf. Theorem I-5.3 of Ref. [24]). Because $x_{nl} < x_{n,l+1}$, the zeros of any $P_n(x)$ are all *simple* (cf. Theorem I-5.2 of Ref. [24]). The first inequality in (16) implies that the sequence $\{x_{nl}\}_{n=l}^{\infty}$ is strictly *decreasing* for any fixed l. Therefore, the respective limits

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} x_{nl} = \xi_l \tag{17}$$

exist. The above properties are intrinsic signatures of any OPS [24]. In what follows, we denote the set of all the limit points by $\Xi = \{\xi_l \,|\, l = 1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$.

Corresponding to the OPS $\{P_n\}$, there is a positive-definite moment functional $\mathcal{L}$ (see Appendix A 1). According to the *representation theorem* (Theorem II-3.1 of Ref. [24]), $\mathcal{L}$ can be characterized by a right continuous distribution function ν that is determined through a suitable limit process (see Appendix A 1). The set of all the points x where $\nu(x)$ has either a finite jump or increases continuously,

$$\mathfrak{S}(\nu) = \{x \,|\, \nu(x+\delta) - \nu(x-\delta) > 0 \text{ for all } \delta > 0\},$$

is called the spectrum of ν, or alternatively the support of $\mathcal{L}$ (cf. p. 51 of Ref. [24]), or the support of the Stieltjes integral measure $d\nu$ induced by ν. For any positive-definite moment functional the set is *infinite* [24].

On recalling the arguments of Ref. [7], $\mathbb{E}(z)$ can be defined as a *regular analytic* function of a complex variable $z \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\mathbb{E}(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\nu(x)}{z - x}. \tag{18}$$

$\mathbb{E}(z)$ is thus the *Stieltjes function* [37–39]. The distribution function ν in the *Stieltjes transform* representation (18) is, assuming the normalization $\nu(-\infty) = 0$, *unique* (see footnote 30 on p. 268 of Ref. [40]). The determinacy of the Stieltjes measure $d\nu$ follows also independently from Carleman's criterion (cf. Eq. (VI-1.14) of Ref. [24]; p. 59 of Ref. [41]) which says that the moment problem is determined if $\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \lambda_l^{-1/2} = \infty$. The latter is obviously satisfied in our case. Note that the polynomials on the r.h.s of Eq. (15) are monic and all their zeros are on the real axis. Then if $\lim_{z\to\infty} z\mathbb{E}(z)$ exists and if the limit is finite (e.g. equals to one) in any sector $\epsilon \leq \arg z \leq \pi - \epsilon$, $0 < \epsilon < \pi/2$, the *Stieltjes transform* representation (18) holds with a *bounded* and non-decreasing $\nu(x)$ (cf. Lemma 2.2 of Ref. [41]).

Hamburger's Theorem XII' [40] guarantees the *Stieltjes transform* representation (18) in any closed finite region Ω of the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ which does not contain any part

of the real axis. An important result of Ref. [7] was that the representation (18) can be extended to any closed interval on real axis located within the open intervals where $\nu = \text{const}$. In other words, one can employ the representation (18) within any closed interval of the real axis which does not have any common point with $\mathfrak{S}(\nu)$. The result can be regarded as an extension of the *Markov* theorem (Theorem 2.6.2 of Ismail book [42] or p. 90 of Ref. [24]).

Denote

$$\sigma \equiv \lim_{j\to\infty} \xi_j.$$

There are only the following possibilities regarding the behavior of the ξ_l (pp. 62-63 of Ref. [24]):

- **(a')** $\xi_l = \sigma = -\infty \qquad (l \geq 1)$
- **(b')** $-\infty < \xi_1 < \xi_2 < \ldots < \xi_l = \sigma$ for some $l \geq 1$
- **(c')** $-\infty < \xi_1 < \xi_2 < \ldots < \xi_l < \ldots < \sigma = \infty$.

In the first two cases the set Ξ is *finite* and thus cannot coincide with the *infinite* $\mathfrak{S}(\nu)$. The latter comprises infinitely many points in addition to the elements of Ξ. The first two cases are also unphysical. The first one already from the very fact that physical models have their energy spectrum bounded from below, whereas all energy levels would be at $-\infty$ in case **(a')**. In case **(b')** the corresponding physical model would have, following the analysis of Ref. [7], a finite number of energy levels, with *infinitely degenerate* highest energy level. We recall that energy levels corresponds to the zeros of $\mathbb{F}(z)$, which are bracketed by the poles of $\mathbb{F}(z)$ [7]. According to Eq. (13), the poles of $\mathbb{F}(z)$ correspond to the limit points $\xi_l^{(1)}$ of sequences $\{x_{nl}^{(1)}\}_{n=l}^{\infty}$ [7]. Now for any associated OPS's (see sec. III.4 of Ref. [24]), the zeros of $P_n^{(\upsilon)}(x)$ and $P_{n-1}^{(\upsilon+1)}(x)$ are *interlaced* (Theorem III-4.1 of Ref. [24]). Specifically,

$$x_{nl}^{(\upsilon)} < x_{n-1,l}^{(\upsilon+1)} < x_{n,l+1}^{(\upsilon)}, \qquad \upsilon = 0, 1. \tag{19}$$

The latter implies $\xi_l \leq \xi_l^{(1)} \leq \xi_{l+1}$ and thereby justifies the above conclusions for energy levels in cases **(a')** and **(b')**.

In case **(c')**, the infinite spectrum $\mathfrak{S}(\nu)$ is formed exclusively by the points of Ξ (see the summary of Sec. II-4 on pp. 62-63 of Ref. [24]). In other words, $\mathfrak{S}(\nu)$ reduces to a one-dimensional discrete lattice $\Lambda \equiv \Xi$ representing the infinite discrete support of $d\nu(x)$ [20]. Indeed, ν experiences a *finite jump* at any point $\xi_k \in \Xi$,

$$0 < \nu(\xi_k) - \nu(\xi_k - 0) = \mathcal{M}_k = \left[\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{P_l^2(\xi_k)}{\mathfrak{n}_l}\right]^{-1}, \tag{20}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{n}_l = \mathcal{L}[1]\lambda_1 \ldots \lambda_l = ||P_l(x)||^2$$

is the squared norm of $P_l(x)$, and the positive numbers $\mathcal{M}_k$ satisfy the condition $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}_k = 1$ [7, 24]. The determinacy of the Stieltjes measure $d\nu$ implies that at all other points of the real axis the sum in the square bracket is *divergent* (cf. Theorem 2.9 and Corollary 2.8 of Ref. [41]; Theorem 2.5.3 and Corollary 2.5.3 of Ref. [43]). The divergence is a hallmark of that the TTRR (4), with the two-term condition (5) taken as an initial condition, can only be satisfied by a *dominant* solution of the TTRR [6, 22]. Case **(c')** implies that for any *physical* model of $\mathcal{R}$, the OPS defined by the TTRR (8) have to be formed by the polynomials of a *discrete* variable with an unbounded spectrum $\mathfrak{S}(\nu)$. Furthermore, in any irreducible subspace the model spectrum is, as expected, *nondegenerate* [7] (see Sec. V A for discussion of this point). There are no level crossings allowing the unique labeling of each state.

On physical grounds we assume $\mathcal{R}$ be limited to case **(c')** in what follows. Although there is a number of sufficient conditions on recurrence coefficients that ensure $\sigma = \infty$ (cf. Eq. (IV-3.7) of Ref. [24] that was employed for the Rabi model in Ref. [7]), they are expected to be satisfied for physical models and there is no need to discuss them here. Similarly to $\mathbb{F}(z)$ studied in Ref. [7], $\mathbb{E}(z)$ can be then represented as a *Mittag-Leffler* partial fraction decomposition,

$$\mathbb{E}(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mathcal{M}_k}{z - \xi_k},$$

defining a meromorphic function in the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ with *real simple* poles and *positive* residues. The series is absolutely and uniformly convergent in any finite domain having a finite distance from the simple poles ξ_j, and it defines there a holomorphic function of z. The corresponding $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$ (in general any one-dimensional irreducible component of Ψ in a spin subspace - see Sec. V B below) has infinite number of *nondegenerate* energy levels without (apart from $+\infty$) any accumulation point. This concludes the proof of the main result of the present work.

We have just shown that the distribution function $\nu(x)$ in the orthogonality relations of the polynomials of discrete variable is an increasing step function. The spectrum of $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$ corresponds to $\mathfrak{S}(\nu)$, which is given by the set Ξ of points of discontinuity of $\nu(x)$. Borrowing *renormalization group* (RG) language, the discrete flows generated by the polynomials zeros flow toward the spectral points. If Σ denotes the spectrum of $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$, Σ coincides with the corresponding discrete lattice $\Lambda \equiv \Xi = \mathfrak{S}(\nu)$.

IV. NUMERICAL IMPLICATIONS

Obviously, if one knows $\nu(x)$ in Eq. (18) explicitly, one also knows $\mathfrak{S}(\nu)$, and the corresponding model can be solved *exactly*. Unfortunately, a general procedure

of recovering $d\nu(x)$ from an initial TTRR is not known. The task can only be performed for the so-called *classical* OPS [14, 15, 24, 42]. In all other cases, apart from some special cases [42], the spectrum have to be determined numerically. However, one can identify numerically only a small number of the very first eigenvalues from the functional dependence of $\mathbb{F}(x)$ (cf. Figs. 1,2 of Ref. [6]; Fig. 1 of Refs. [7, 44]). Soon afterwards, $\mathbb{F}(x)$ displays a *featureless* monotonically decreasing behavior [8] - cf. F77 code made available online [45]. The latter has been traced down to a curious property of zeros of associated OPS [8] - cf. data files [46]. In spite of the sharp inequalities

$$x^{(2)}_{n-1,l-1} < x^{(1)}_{nl} < x_{n+1,l+1},$$

which follow from the second of the rigorous sharp inequalities in Eq. (19), one soon finds that after a first few of initial zeros [for instance for the Rabi model beginning with $l \gtrsim 2$ for $(\kappa, \Delta) = (0.2, 0.4)$] [8]

$$x^{(2)}_{n-1,l-1} \simeq x^{(1)}_{nl} \simeq x_{n+1,l+1}. \tag{21}$$

For $l \gtrsim 4$ and the Rabi model with $(\kappa, \Delta) = (0.2, 0.4)$ the zeros coincide up to more than *five* decimal places (provided that n is sufficiently large) - cf. data files [46]. Because of the coagulation of zeros (21), the respective higher order poles and zeros of $\mathbb{F}(x)$ turn out soon to be closer to each other than machine precision. Thus any singularity and any zero of $\mathbb{F}(x)$, and most probably also that of $\mathbb{E}(x)$, become *numerically invisible* [8]. The latter implies that any practical implementation of the Schweber method that consists in locating zeros of $\mathbb{F}(x)$ *fails* for higher order eigenvalues [8]. Depending on model parameters, one can determine merely up to *10-20* eigenvalues, and that already in the exactly solvable limit of the displaced harmonic oscillator [8] - cf. F77 code made available online [45].

Our recipe for determining the first N_0 energy levels of $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$ does not involve either searching for zeros of $\mathbb{F}(x)$ or for the poles of $\mathbb{E}(x)$ from the functional dependence of neither of the two functions. Instead our analytic results enable one to get rid of both $\mathbb{F}(x)$ and $\mathbb{E}(x)$ and to focus exclusively on the flows of polynomial zeros x_{nl}. The recipe is as follows:

- Choose $N_c \geq N_0$ and determine the first N_0 zeros $x_{N_c l}$, $l \leq N_0$, of $P_{N_c}(x)$. Usually a good starting point is to take $N_c \approx N_0 + 20$. Because $P_{N_c}(x)$ has N_c simple zeros, any omission of a zero could be easily identified.

- Gradually increase the cut-off value of N_c. The latter is what drives the incessant flows of polynomial zeros $x_{N_c l}$ [see the first sharp inequality in Eq. (16)], wherein each flow is characterized by the parameter l.

- Monitor convergence of the respective flows induced by the very first n zeros of $P_{N_c}(x)$. Each flow is a monotonically decreasing sequence having necessary a fixed limit point (17). Terminate your calculations when the N_0-th zero of $P_{N_c}(x)$ converged to ξ_{N_0} within predetermined accuracy. Then as a rule all other flows $x_{N_c l}$ with $l < N_0$ have converged, too.

The examples of Ref. [8] show that the convergence of the zeros to the spectrum is very fast. The numerical limits in calculating zeros were set by *over-* and *underflows*. Typically, with increasing N_c the respective recurrences yielded first increasing and then decreasing $P_{N_c}(x)$. Here we sketch the basic features of an improved algorithm that allows to determine practically an *unlimited* number of energy levels within corresponding machine precision. Our procedure to avoid the *over-* and *underflows* is rather straightforward. Taking as an example the recurrences (12) and common double precision, one monitors the magnitudes of the current three recurrence terms ϕ_{n+1}, ϕ_n, and ϕ_{n-1} as n increases towards N_c. If the magnitude approaches 10^{308} (10^{-308}), the last three recurrence terms ϕ_{n+1}, ϕ_n, and ϕ_{n-1} are rescaled by 10^{-308} (10^{308}). Because the recurrence coefficients are well behaving (they are fairly monotonic with exponents $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta = -1$), such a rescaling will move all three recurrence terms away from *over-* or *underflows*. The TTRR (12) is then restarted anew with the rescaled ϕ_{n+1}, ϕ_n, and ϕ_{n-1}. Such a rescaling by a constant factor obviously does not alter the position of zeros of the final ϕ_{N_c}. Also no loss of valid digits is involved, because the change only involves exponent. Thus by the above rescaling one can stitch the recurrence pieces together, thereby avoiding potential *over-* and *underflows*. The stitching can be continued up to the cut-off N_c as large as the largest integer that can be stored within a given precision (e.g. 2^{53} in double precision [47]). Further numerical details are relegated to forthcoming publication [48].

V. DISCUSSION

A. $\mathcal{R}$ vs quasi-exactly-solvable models

We have established the following properties of the models described by $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$: (i) the solution Ψ to the Schrödinger equation (3) is the *generating function* for a set of polynomials $\{P_n(E)\}$ in the energy variable E, and (ii) the spectral points of $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$ can be determined as fixed points of the flows generated by the polynomials zeros. The properties resemble those of a subset of *quasi-exactly-solvable* (QES) problems of quantum mechanics [49–51]. The QES models are distinguished by the fact that a *finite* (and only a *finite*) part of their spectrum can be solved *analytically* and in *closed* form. The corresponding energy eigenvalues are called the quasi-exact energy eigenvalues [49, 50] and are commonly referred to as an *exceptional* spectrum [4]. The solution to the Schrödinger equation (3) is the *generating function* for

a set of polynomials in the energy variable E [51] and the quasi-exact energy eigenvalues can be determined as the *zeros* of a critical Bender-Dunne polynomial $P_J(E)$ [51]. The condition of quasi-exact solvability is reflected in the vanishing of the norm of all polynomials whose degree n exceeds a critical value J [51]. The corresponding moment functional $\mathcal{L}$ of such a polynomial system is necessarily *degenerate* (cf. Appendix A 1). Thus the Bender-Dunne polynomials do not form a conventional OPS. Importantly, one speaks about the quasi-exact-solvability already if the above properties apply for a discrete subset of model parameters. There are in general infinitely many parameters for which need not exist any polynomial solution, yet a model is still called QES.

B. Almost exactly solvable models

The case when $\Psi \in \mathbb{C}^N$ can be *fully* diagonalized in the spin subspace (e.g. the Rabi model) deserves a special attention. A sufficient condition for the full diagonalization is that the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ possesses an *Abelian* (e.g. cyclic) symmetry G of the order N. Then G has precisely N *one-dimensional* irreducible representations (IR) Γ_γ, $\gamma = 1, 2, \ldots, N$. Let $g_j \in G$ are represented by $N \times N$ matrices R_j in $\mathbb{C}^N$ (e.g. realized in terms of the *Sylvester* generator S [5, 52]). The corresponding one-dimensional *orthogonal projectors* into particular IR Γ_γ of G are given by [53, 54]

$$P_\gamma = (1/N) \sum_{j=1}^{N} \chi^*_\gamma(g_j) R_j,$$

where $\chi_\gamma(g_j)$ are the characters of $g_j \in G$ in the given IR Γ_γ. The total wave function $\Psi \in \mathbb{C}^N$ can be thus projected out into *one-dimensional* irreducible components, each satisfying its own eigenvalue equation (3). The FGT [27] employed for $N = 2$ [4] can be considered as a special case of the more general *projection* method of explicitly determining irreducible representations of a *finite* group [53, 54]. The property **(c')** of Sec. III of energy levels of the respective $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$ describing the one-dimensional irreducible components of Ψ does not exclude *degeneracies* in the whole spectrum. Any degeneracy corresponds to a nonzero overlap of the nondegenerate discrete spectra in the respective irreducible (e.g. parity invariant) subspaces governed by different $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$ [7]. In most cases the special points of the overlap correspond to the QES part of the spectrum [7, 29].

The *fully* diagonalizable models in the spin subspace could be thought of as *almost exactly solvable* (AES) models. Indeed, had the flows of zeros terminated for some finite N, any such model would be considered as exactly, i.e. *algebraically*, solvable. In contrast to the QES models, the *almost exact solvability* applies (i) to the entire spectrum and (ii) for all model parameters. As exemplified by the QES Rabi model, the AES models comprise some of the QES models. Additionally, the example of a displaced harmonic oscillator shows that the AES models may comprise *exactly solvable models*.

C. Exactly solvable models

Let $\mathbb{D}_x$ be a suitable divided-difference operator (discrete derivative) [37–39] that maps $\Pi_n[x]$, the linear space of polynomials in x over $\mathbb{C}$ with degree at most $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, into $\Pi_{n-1}[x]$ [14, 15, 37–39, 55]. Being a polynomial of degree $n-1$, one can represent $\mathbb{D}_x P_n(x)$ in general only as (cf. Theorem I-2.2 of [24, 37, 39])

$$\mathbb{D}_x P_n(x) = \sum_{r=0}^{n-1} c_{n,r} P_r(x),$$

with some constant coefficients $c_{n,r}$. The hallmark of exactly solvable models is existence of a *structure relation* satisfied by the corresponding OPS $\{P_n(x)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$,

$$\mathbb{D}_x P_n(x) = -B_n(x) P_n(x) + A_n(x) P_{n-1}(x), \qquad (22)$$

where the coefficients $A_n(x)$ and $B_n(x)$ are in general nonpolynomial functions [14, 15, 37–39, 55]. Obviously, if there is one structure relation (22), there is another one. The other one results by expressing P_{n-1} from the fundamental TTRR (8) and substituting it back into the original structure relation (22). The resulting pair of structure relations (i) leads directly to a pair of mutually adjoint raising and lowering *ladder operators* [55], (ii) implies that orthogonal polynomials satisfy in general a second-order difference equation (cf. Sec. 4 of Ref. [55]), and (iii) allows one to introduce a *discrete* analogue of the *Bethe Ansatz* equations (cf. Sec. 5 of Ref. [55]). The structure relation (22) can be established for any *classical* OPS (p. 783 of Ref. [56]; Section 6 of Ref. [57]; Proposition 2.6 of Ref. [58]), *semi-classical* OPS (Theorem 1 of Ref. [38]; Proposition 4.4 of Ref. [39]), and any OPS orthogonal with respect to a discrete measure supported on *equidistant* points (Theorem 1.1 of Ref. [55]). [In the *semi-classical* case, the function $\mathbb{E}(x)$ itself satisfies a first order difference equation with polynomial coefficients (Theorem 1 of Ref. [38]; Proposition 4.1 of Ref. [39]).] In brief one finds a structure relation only for the OPS which belong to the Askey scheme (p. 183 of Ref. [59]) or to the q-analogue of the Askey scheme (p. 413 of Ref. [59]). In each of the above cases, $\Lambda \equiv \Xi$ representing the infinite discrete support of $d\nu(x)$ is necessarily one of four primary classes of special non-uniform lattices [37–39]: the linear lattice, the linear q-lattice, the quadratic lattice, and the q-quadratic lattice (for their properties see Table 2 of Ref. [39]). The q-quadratic lattice, in its general non-symmetrical form, is the most general case and the other lattices can be found from this by limiting processes [39]. More specifically, either

$$\Lambda = \{x \,|\, x = u_2 n^2 + u_1 n + u_0,\, n \in \mathbb{N}\}, \qquad (23)$$

or

$$\Lambda = \{x \,|\, x = u_2 q^{-n} + u_1 q^n + u_0,\, n \in \mathbb{N}\}, \qquad (24)$$

where u_j are real constants and $0 < q < 1$. Thus the spectrum Σ of an exactly solvable $H_b \in \mathcal{R}$ can only assume one of the above forms of Λ. Thereby we have independently arrived at essentially the same type of exactly solvable spectra as did Odake and Sasaki [60] within the framework of their exactly solvable discrete quantum mechanics with real shifts (cf. Eqs. (4.7-11) of Ref. [60]). Conversely, it appears that if $\Sigma \neq \Lambda$, where Λ is one of the above types (23) and (24), then the model *cannot* be exactly solvable.

An example is provided by exactly solvable displaced harmonic oscillator having equidistant spectrum Σ. The corresponding OPS is that of the Charlier polynomials [24, 63] and $\Lambda \equiv \Xi$ is an equidistant lattice which coincides with Σ [8]. $\Delta \neq 0$ in the Rabi Hamiltonian (11) induces a deformation of the Charlier polynomials to *non-classical* discrete orthogonal polynomials and, at the same time, a deformation of the underlying equidistant lattice Λ. The deformed lattice does not correspond to any of the primary lattice classes implying that the Rabi model is not exactly solvable. Although neither the weight function nor the deformed lattice are analytically known, the above deformation is a *norm preserving deformation* of the underlying OPS [8].

Algorithmic complexity theory [61] has been used, although without much success, to discuss the degree of randomness of the sequence of energy eigenvalues of conservative quantum systems [62]. In the present case, an alignment of the physical spectrum Σ with one of the primary classes (23) and (24) of lattices $\Lambda \equiv \Xi$ can identify a model as exactly solvable. The degree of randomness of the sequence of energy eigenvalues could be then defined as a minimal distance from the four primary classes of special non-uniform lattices. Further details will be discussed elsewhere [48].

D. Comparison with other numerical methods

Our method of determining energy levels differs from any of the known methods that involve (i) a brute force numerical diagonalization, (ii) computation of a correlation function $\langle\psi(\mathbf{r},0)|\psi(\mathbf{r},t)\rangle$ from a numerical solution $\psi(\mathbf{r},t)$ as in a spectral method by Feit et al [64], (iii) searching for zeros of analytic functions having infinite number of poles and zeros on the real axis (e.g. determined by infinite continued fractions as in the Schweber method (cf. Eq. (A.16) of Ref. [1]) or as in Braak's approach [4]), and (iv) numerical diagonalization using Hill's determinant approach [65].

A brute force numerical diagonalization allows one to determine around *2000* energy levels in double precision (ca 16 digits) for the Rabi model. This is much less than is possible by our approach. Also any deeper analytic insight is missing. Searching for zeros of analytic functions yields only ca. *20* levels. Employing further tricks one can hardly overcome the range of ~ 100 levels. Using Hill's determinant approach one can determine ~ 500 levels, which is still merely half of what was possible to obtain by the simple stepping algorithm employed in Ref. [8].

E. Relation with earlier work

A proof of our main result in the special case of a displaced harmonic oscillator has been provided in our earlier work [8]. Yet the proof was not general. It was made possible thanks to a largely fortuitous coincidence that the orthogonal polynomials of discrete variable relevant for the displaced harmonic oscillator are the well-known (monic) *Charlier polynomials* [63] (cf. Eqs. VI-1.4-5 of Ref. [24]) [8]. For the case of the Rabi model [1, 2], the relevant orthogonal polynomials of discrete variable are not classical one and have not been studied in detail so far [8]. As a consequence, only a partial proof of the above statement could have been provided that was limited to the case when a dimensionless interaction constant $\kappa < 1$ [8]. On using the identity (2), the latter has now been proven rigorously, thereby confirming earlier numerical evidence that the statement remains to be valid also for $\kappa \geq 1$ [8].

On adopting the notation $\psi(n) = p_n(x)$, our TTRR (8) can be interpreted as a *finite difference* Schrödinger equation [60, 66]

$$\psi(n+1) + c_n\psi(n) + \lambda_n\psi(n-1) = x\psi(n), \qquad (25)$$

with x playing the role of an *eigenvalue*. Thus our *recurrence class of purely bosonic models with polynomial coefficients*, $\mathcal{R}$, provides a realization of $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}$ of Odake and Sasaki in the so-called discrete quantum mechanics (dQM) with *real shifts* (rdQM) (cf. Sec. III of Ref. [60]). Eq. (25) has been earlier studied by Spiridonov et al [66].

VI. CONCLUSIONS

A class $\mathcal{R}$ of purely bosonic models has been characterized having the following properties in the Bargmann Hilbert space of analytic functions: (i) wave function $\psi(\epsilon, z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi_n(\epsilon) z^n$ is the *generating function* for orthogonal polynomials $\phi_n(\epsilon)$ of a *discrete* energy variable ϵ, (ii) any Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$ has nondegenerate purely point spectrum that corresponds to infinite discrete support of measure $d\nu(x)$ in the orthogonality relation of the polynomials ϕ_n, (iii) the support is determined exclusively by the points of discontinuity of $\nu(x)$, (iv) the spectrum of $\hat{H}_b \in \mathcal{R}$ can be numerically determined as fixed points of monotonic flows of the zeros of orthogonal polynomials $\phi_n(\epsilon)$, (v) one can compute prac-

tically an unlimited number of energy levels (e.g. 2^{53} in double precision). If a model of $\mathcal{R}$ is exactly solvable, its spectrum can only assume one of four qualitatively different types. Our results were shown to apply to a class of spin-boson quantum models that are, at least partially, diagonalizable in a spin subspace. The class is broad enough to encompass the Rabi model and its various generalizations.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I thank Prof.'s W. Gautschi, M. E. H. Ismail, N. S. Witte, Y.-Z. Zhang, and A. Zhedanov for discussion. Continuous support of MAKM is largely acknowledged.

Appendix A: Mathematical remarks

1. Moment functional $\mathcal{L}$

Satisfying the TTRR such as (8) is the necessary and sufficient condition that there exists a unique positive definite moment functional $\mathcal{L}$, such that for the family of polynomials $\{p_n\}$ holds

$$\mathcal{L}[1] = \lambda_0, \qquad \mathcal{L}[p_m(x)p_n(x)] = \lambda_0\lambda_1 \ldots \lambda_n \delta_{mn}, \quad \text{(A1)}$$

where $m, n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ and δ_{mn} is the Kronecker symbol. Thereby the polynomials $\{p_n\}$ form an OPS. Because $\lambda_n > 0$, the norm of the polynomials p_n is positive definite, $\mathcal{L}[p_n^2(x)] > 0$, and $\mathcal{L}$ is a *positive definite non-degenerate* moment functional (p. 16 of Ref. [24]). It is reminded here that the QES models have *degenerate* $\mathcal{L}$, i. e., $\lambda_{J+1} = 0$ for some $J > 0$.

According to the *representation theorem* (Theorem II-3.1 of Ref. [24]), the *distribution* function ν of the positive moment functional $\mathcal{L}$,

$$\mathcal{L}[x^n] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^n \, d\nu(x) = \mu_n \qquad (n = 0, 1, \ldots), \quad \text{(A2)}$$

is the limit of a sequence of bounded, right continuous, nondecreasing step functions $\nu_n(x)$'s,

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu_n(x) = 0 \qquad (-\infty \le x < x_{n1}), \\ &\nu_n(x) = M_{n1} + \ldots + M_{np} \quad (x_{np} \le x < x_{n,p+1}), \\ &\nu_n(x) = \mu_0 \qquad (x \ge x_{nn}), \end{aligned} \quad \text{(A3)}$$

where x_{nl}, $l = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, are the zeros of $p_n(x)$, Consequently

- $\nu_n(x)$ has exactly n points of increase, x_{nk},
- the discontinuity of $\nu_n(x)$ at each x_{nk} equals M_{nk} $(k = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$,
- at least the first $(2n-1)$ moments of $\nu_n(x)$ are identical with those of $\nu(x)$, i.e.,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^l \, d\nu_n(x) = \mu_l \qquad (l = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, 2n-1). \quad \text{(A4)}$$

2. The ratio in Eq. (15) for a finite n

An indication of that the poles of $\mathbb{E}(x)$ could correspond to the set Ξ is provided by considering the ratio in (15) for a finite n. Then the ratio in (15) enables the partial fraction decomposition (Theorem III-4.3 of Ref. [24]),

$$\frac{P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_n(z)} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\nu_n(x)}{z-x} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{M_{nk}}{z - x_{nk}}, \quad \text{(A5)}$$

where the numbers M_{nl} are all *positive* (cf. Appendix A 1) and satisfy the condition $\sum_{l=1}^{n} M_{nl} = 1$ [7, 24].

3. Further consequences of the Perron-Kreuser theorem

The Perron-Kreuser theorem (Theorem 2.3 in Ref. [22]) implies that the dominant solutions of the TTRR (4) do not generate an element of $\mathfrak{b}$ if

- **(a")** $2\alpha > \beta$ and either **(i)** $\alpha > -1/2$ or **(ii)** $\alpha = -1/2$ and $|a| \ge 1$,
- **(b")** $2\alpha = \beta$ and either **(i)** $\alpha > -1/2$ or **(ii)** $\alpha = -1/2$ and the larger root $|t_2| \le |t_1|$ of $t^2 + at + b = 0$ satisfies $|t_1| \ge 1$.

4. Stieltjes transform

One can, in principle, find ν and determine its infinite discrete support $\Lambda \equiv \Xi$ by inverting the Stieltjes transform (18). Indeed if the representation (18) holds for $z \notin \mathbb{R}$, then [41, 43]

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\left[\nu(x_2) + \nu(x_2 - 0)\right] - \frac{1}{2}\left[\nu(x_1) + \nu(x_1 - 0)\right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \lim_{\epsilon \to 0_+} \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \left[\mathbb{E}(t + i\epsilon) - \mathbb{E}(t - i\epsilon)\right] dt. \end{aligned} \quad \text{(A6)}$$

Recovering ν from $\mathbb{E}$ constitutes the famous *problem of moments* [41, 43]. Every isolated pole $z = u$ of $\mathbb{E}(z)$ contributes a discrete mass of ν at $x = u$ and the mass equals the residue of $\mathbb{E}(z)$ at $z = u$, which is given by Eq. (20). At all other points the limit in our case vanishes. The orthogonality measures of several important systems of orthogonal polynomials were found by (i) computing the large n asymptotic of $P_n(x)$ and $P_n^{(1)}(x)$ in the representation (18) followed by (ii) the inversion of the Stieltjes transform [42].

[1] S. Schweber, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **41**, 205-229 (1967).
[2] I. I. Rabi, Phys. Rev. **49**, 324-328 (1936).
[3] V. Bargmann, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **14**, 187-214 (1961).
[4] D. Braak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 100401 (2011).
[5] V. V. Albert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 180401 (2012).
[6] A. Moroz, Europhys. Lett. **100**, 60010 (2012) (arXiv:1209.3265).
[7] A. Moroz, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **338**, 319-340 (2013) (arXiv:1302.2565).
[8] A. Moroz, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **340**, 252-266 (2014) (arXiv:1305.2595).
[9] Y.-Z. Zhang, arXiv:1304.7827 [quant-ph].
[10] Y.-Z. Zhang, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **347**, 122-129 (2014) (arXiv:1403.4737).
[11] H. B. Shore and L. M. Sander, Phys. Rev. B **7**, 4537-4546 (1973).
[12] R. Haydock, The recursive solution of the Schrödinger equation, in: H. Ehrenreich, F. Seitz, D. Turnbull (Eds.), Solid State Physics vol. 35, Academic Press, New York, 1980, pp. 215-294.
[13] A. Moroz, "Haydock's recursive solution of self-adjoint problems. Discrete spectrum", to appear in Ann. Phys. (N.Y.).
[14] A. F. Nikiforov, S. K. Suslov, V. B. Uvarov, Classical Orthogonal Polynomials of a Discrete Variable (Springer, Berlin, 1991).
[15] M. Lorente, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **153**, 321-330 (2003).
[16] G. Khitrova, H. M. Gibbs, M. Kira, S. W. Koch, and A. Scherer, Nat. Phys. **2**, 81-90 (2006).
[17] J. Bourassa, J. M. Gambetta, A. A. Abdumalikov, Jr., O. Astafiev, Y. Nakamura, and A. Blais, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 032109 (2009).
[18] P. Forn-Díaz, J. Lisenfeld, D. Marcos, J. J. García-Ripoll, E. Solano, C. J. P. M. Harmans, and J. E. Mooij, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 237001 (2010).
[19] T. Niemczyk, et al, Nat. Phys. **6**, 772-776 (2010).
[20] Such a spectrum, and as in case **(c')** below, is typical for any regular Sturm-Liouville problem comprising among other potential wells in one dimension with infinitely high walls and a continuous bottom $V(x)$.
[21] A. O. Barut and L. Girardello, Commun. Math. Phys. **21**, 41-55 (1971).
[22] W. Gautschi, SIAM Review **9**, 24-82 (1967).
[23] For instance for the Chebyshev polynomials (Gautschi, private communication).
[24] T. S. Chihara, An Introduction to Orthogonal Polynomials (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1978).
[25] The reason for a different nomenclature regarding TTRR's (4) and (8) is that the TTRR of the form (4) is common in general theory of recurrences [22], whereas the TTRR of the form (8) are employed in the theory of orthogonal polynomials [24]. We maintained the respective notations in order to facilitate comparison with relevant results of Refs. [22, 24].
[26] M. Wagner, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **17**, 2319-2333 (1984).
[27] R. L. Fulton and M. Gouterman, J. Chem. Phys. **35**, 1059-1071 (1961).
[28] M. Schiró, M. Bordyuh, B. Öztop, and H. E. Türeci, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 053601 (2012).
[29] M. Tomka, O. El Araby, M. Pletyukhov, and V. Gritsev, arXiv:1307.7876 [quant-ph].
[30] B. Gardas and J. Dajka, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **46**, 265302 (2013).
[31] J. Larson, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **46**, 224016 (2013).
[32] Y.-H. Lee, W.-L. Yang, and Y.-Z. Zhang, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **43**, 185204 (2010).
[33] Y.-H. Lee, W.-L. Yang, and Y.-Z. Zhang, Nonlinearity **24**, 1975-1986 (2011).
[34] Y.-Z. Zhang and A. Moroz, in preparation.
[35] Here we depart from the notation of our earlier publications [7, 8] where the respective OPS for $\upsilon = 0, 1, 2$ corresponded to $\upsilon = -1, 0, 1$ and where we called the respective monic OPS with $\upsilon = 0, 1$ *associated* to $\{P_n^{(-1)}\}$ (cf Sec. III-4 of Ref. [24]).
[36] The zeros of $P_n(x)$ are the eigenvalues of a corresponding *Jacobi* matrix, which are special case of Hermitian tridiagonal matrices (cf. exercise I-5.7 of Ref. [24] or Appendix of Ref. [7]).
[37] A. P. Magnus, Associated Askey-Wilson polynomials as Laguerre-Hahn orthogonal polynomials, in: M. Alfaro (Ed.) et al., Orthogonal Polynomials and their Applications, Proceedings, Springer Lecture Notes Math., Segovia 1986, 1329, Springer, Berlin (1988), pp. 261-278
[38] A. P. Magnus, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **65**, 253-265 (1995).
[39] N. S. Witte, arXiv:1204.2328 [math.CA].
[40] H. Hamburger, Math. Ann. **81**, 234-319 (1920). (Can be freely accessed through the European digital mathematical library at http://eudml.org)
[41] J. A. Shohat and J. D. Tamarkin, The Problem of Moments (American Math. Soc., Providence, 1970).
[42] M. E. H. Ismail, Classical and Quantum Orthogonal Polynomials in One Variable (Cambridge University Press, 2005).
[43] N. I. Akhiezer, The Classical Moment Problem and Some Related Questions in Analysis (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965).
[44] A. Moroz, arXiv:1205.3139 [quant-ph].
[45] The source code can be freely downloaded from `http://www.wave-scattering.com/rabi.html`.
[46] Data files *gp2dp4n300.dat obtained for $(\kappa, \Delta) = (0.2, 0.4)$ and $n = 300$ are available from `http://www.wave-scattering.com/rabi.html`.
[47] IEEE standard for floating-point arithmetic (IEEE 754-2008).
[48] A. Moroz, in preparation.
[49] A. V. Turbiner and A. G. Ushveridze, Phys. Lett. A **126**, 181-183 (1987).
[50] A. V. Turbiner, Commun. Math. Phys. **118**, 467-474 (1988).
[51] C. M. Bender and G. V. Dunne, J. Math. Phys. **37**, 6-11 (1996).
[52] C. Sachse, Theor. Math. Phys. **149**, 1299-1311 (2006).
[53] P. H. E. Meijer, Phys. Rev. **95**, 1443-1449 (1954).
[54] R. J. Finkelstein and M. Moe, Phys. Rev. **100**, 1775-1779 (1955).
[55] M. E. H. Ismail, I. Nikolova, and P. Simeonov, The Ramanujan Journal **8**, 475-502 (2005).

[56] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, Handbook of Mathematical Functions (Dover Publications, New York, 1973). (`http://people.math.sfu.ca/~cbm/aands/page_783.htm`)
[57] W. A. Al-Salam, Characterization theorems for orthogonal polynomials. In Orthogonal Polynomials: Theory and Practice (P. Nevai. ed.). NATO ASI series C, vol. 294, pp. 1-24 (Kluwer, 1990).
[58] A. G. García, F. Marcellán, and L. Salto, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **57**, 147-162 (1995).
[59] R. Koekoek, P. A. Lesky, and R. F. Swarttouw, Hypergeometric orthogonal polynomials and their q-analogues. Springer, 1-st edition, 2010., Secs. 9,14.
[60] S. Odake and R. Sasaki, J. Math. Phys. **49**, 053503 (2008) (arXiv:0712.4106).
[61] P. Martin-Löf, Inform. Control **9**(6), 602-619 (1966).
[62] G. Casati, I. Guarneri, and F. Valz-Gris, Phys. Rev. A **30**, 1586-1588 (1984).
[63] C. V. L. Charlier, Ark. Mat. Astr. Fys. **2**, 1-9 (1905-6).
[64] M. D. Feit, J. A. Fleck, Jr., and A. Steiger, J. Comp. Phys. **47**, 412-433 (1982).
[65] Q.-W. Wang and Y.-L. Liu, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **46**, 435303 (2013).
[66] V. Spiridonov, L. Vinet, and A. Zhedanov, Lett. Math. Phys. **29**, 63-73 (1993).